

ALBERTA
LAW ENFORCEMENT
REVIEW BOARD



ANNUAL REPORT

1996

**ALBERTA
Law Enforcement Review Board
1996 Annual Report**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page #
Introduction	1
Mandate of the Board	1
Board Membership	2
Board Accommodation - Staff - Financial	2
Disclosure	3
Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Legislation	4
References and Recommendations	5
Board Decisions	6
Conferences and Presentations	6
Technology Advances	7
Summary of Board Decisions	7
a) Citizen Appeals	
- Allowed in Part	7
- Dismissed Upon Hearing	8
- Dismissed - Lack of Prosecution	10
- Withdrawn	11
b) Police Officer Appeals	
- Withdrawn	12
Statistical Analysis of Appeals Filed With The Board	12

INTRODUCTION

Public accountability is the central issue in complaints against members of professions, such as policing. In Alberta, municipal police officers are subject to a public complaints process through the *Alberta Police Act*, SA 1988, chapter P-12.01 (with amendments in force as of June 25, 1991). The *Act* provides that the chief of police is primarily responsible for the disposition of complaints concerning officer misconduct or policies and services. The Law Enforcement Review Board is the appeal body for complaints concerning officer conduct. The Law Enforcement Review Board also has the power to inquire into matters concerning complaints on its own initiative (s. 17) and has the powers of a commissioner under the *Public Inquiries Act*. The activities of the Board for the calendar year 1996 are detailed in this report.

MANDATE/ROLE OF THE BOARD

The Law Enforcement Review Board is a quasi-judicial body established under the *Alberta Police Act*. The Board provides an independent means for reviewing public complaints concerning police conduct and for appeals by officers from disciplinary action. The mandate of the Board is derived from the *Police Act*, Part 2, Sections 9 through 20.

The principal activity of the Board is to hear appeals from citizens who have complained about a police officer's actions and are not satisfied with the disposition of their complaint. Police officers who have been the subject of discipline arising out of a complaint and who are aggrieved with the decision of their chief of police may also appeal to the Board. The Board provides a forum for both citizens and police officers, separate and apart from the police service involved. The principal objective of the Board is to conduct independent and impartial reviews.

Hearings are held as required, depending on the number of appeals filed, usually in the municipality where the issue arose. Normally, three Board members are in attendance at each Board hearing. The *Police Act* stipulates that the Board be composed of not fewer than three members appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. The *Police Act* specifies for the purposes of conducting an appeal or an inquiry, a quorum of the Board shall consist of two members of the Board.

BOARD MEMBERSHIP

The following individuals were members of the Law Enforcement Review Board during 1996:

P.J. Knoll, Q.C.	Chairman	Calgary, Alberta
C.R. Cunningham	Member	Nestow, Alberta
G.J. Greig	Member	Edmonton, Alberta
F.G. Lowe	Member	Calgary, Alberta

The *Police Act* provides that at least one member of the Board be an active member of the Law Society of Alberta, and that the Chairman must be an active member of the Law Society of Alberta. In case of illness, absence or other disability of the Chairman, the member in attendance with the longest period of service on the Board shall act in place of the Chairman.

Term of Membership

Members of the Board are appointed by Order in Council for a term of not more than three years and are eligible for reappointment. According to the *Act*, a member continues to hold office until reappointment or a successor is appointed.

Remuneration

Board members are provided remuneration through general Order in Council #769/93. The Chairman and members are entitled to paid travel and living expenses in accordance with the Subsistence and Travel Allowance Regulation made by Ministerial Order 6/84, as though they were employees of the government. Details of these Orders are available to the public.

BOARD ACCOMMODATION - STAFF - FINANCIAL

The office of the Law Enforcement Review Board is located on the 10th Floor, 10365 - 97 Street, Edmonton, Alberta. This office is open during normal business hours to receive inquiries from members of the public, a police officer, or a respective police service in regard to its function.

The Board has one full time staff member assigned to handle and provide administrative support in order to accomplish its mandate. This is the position of Secretary to the Board, who handles administrative and support functions. Regular support is also provided by Counsel to the Board in the handling of appeals.

As noted the Board has only one full time staff person. Board members are not public service employees and do not receive any form of employee benefits. Financial management of Board matters is coordinated through the Finance and Administration Branch of the Public Security Division. The Board does not administer its own budget and is subject to accountability for expenditures through normal government budgetary and expenditure review. The financial records of the Board are available for public review in the same manner and to the same extent as are other public service expenditure records.

The Alberta Law Enforcement Review Board compares very favourably against law enforcement review agencies in other Canadian provinces in the context of per capita expenditures. In some of the larger provinces the cost of law enforcement review runs to millions of dollars, and greatly exceeds the Alberta per capita cost. Responsible and prudent expenditure in this regard arises in part from the structure of oversight functions set out in the *Police Act*. The Board attempts in all instances to carry out its duties in a cost efficient and productive manner.

DISCLOSURE

On June 19, 1996, the Board implemented a new disclosure policy. This policy is set out in the Board Policy Manual (No. 4) and replaced the policy which had been in place since 1993. The new policy provides for active dissemination of the statement or report provided by an officer(s) given in response to a public complaint. In the result all appellants are provided the report or statement (if made) of the complained of officer(s) with the return of procedural information normally provided by the Board. The Board's disclosure policy embraces the requirements of the *Alberta Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (F.O.I.P.) Act*. More information in that regard is provided under the next heading.

Of the 37 cases handled by the Law Enforcement Review Board in 1996, 11 (30%) of the citizen appellants requested disclosure of Board files. This represents a decrease of 2% over 1995. Of those, 4 (36% - representing a decrease of 24% from 1995) disclosures were to appellants from Calgary and 7 (64% - representing an increase of 24% from 1995) from Edmonton.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY LEGISLATION

Since the commencement of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (F.O.I.P.)* legislation the Board has received two requests under the Act. The first request was processed as required by legislation. The applicant subsequently filed an appeal with the Office of the Privacy Commissioner and both parties participated in a mediation process. The applicant then sought an inquiry under Section 66 of the *F.O.I.P. Act*. After a lengthy process the Privacy Commissioner issued Order 96-003 concerning material at issue. For the most part the Privacy Commissioner confirmed the positions taken by the Board concerning refusals to release specific records. An appeal from the inquiry decision was not launched by the Board or the applicant. Order 96-003 (No. 1010) should be considered useful reading for all Alberta police commissions prior to the in force date of the *F.O.I.P. Act* concerning "local public bodies". The second request was also processed as required by legislation. Disclosure of information was provided to the applicant pursuant to *F.O.I.P.* provisions.

On June 19, 1996, the Board Chairman specified (s. 83(1), *F.O.I.P.*) records that are to be disclosed to an appellant (applicant) without a formal application under the *F.O.I.P. Act* (Board Policy No. 5). All of the specified records had formally been subject to disclosure through procedures available under the 1993 Board disclosure policy. It is anticipated that additional items will be specified in the foreseeable future.

The Board is inclined to expand the current specification list as this process permits disclosure of records without a detailed interface with the *F.O.I.P.* legislation. *F.O.I.P.* procedures are very extensive and time consuming. The specification procedure is considered a cost efficient mechanism for release of records. It is also the case that the specification procedure can be implemented in such a manner that sensitive information within specified records can be retained by operation of the *F.O.I.P. Act*.

In regard to the *F.O.I.P. Act* the Board is taking steps to keep abreast of changes and developments as the new legislation unfolds. The Board Secretary has been directed in this connection to take all in-service courses and instruction available from the Departments of Justice and Public Works, Supply and Services. The Board is also on the alert for developments in other Canadian jurisdictions that may impact on the interpretation of the Alberta legislation.

REFERENCES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

An important function of the Board is to make references and recommendations to municipal police commissions and police services arising out of appeals filed to the Board. In most instances references or recommendations are concerned with existing practices or policies that are considered ineffective or problematic. Prevention and improvement is the context for most Board measures in this regard. In the majority of cases the Board establishes an interface with the municipal commission concerned to secure productive consideration. In some instances direct contact is made with the police service involved. The following references and recommendations have been made over the last several years:

- 1996
 - Recommendations for Improvements in the Disciplinary Hearing Process (No. 032-96).
 - Recommendations for Training of Presenting and Presiding Officers (No. 024-96).
 - Reference Concerning Strip Searches (No. 027-96).
 - Reference Concerning Shackling of Arrested Persons and Video Taping of Arrest Processing Area (No. 018-96).
- 1995
 - Reference Concerning Officer Training and Detention of Children (No. 029-95).
 - Reference Concerning Enforcement of Custody Orders (No. 006-95).
- 1994
 - Reference Concerning Transportation in Police Vans (No. 017-94).
 - Reference Concerning Review of Warrant Procedures (No. 022-94).
- 1993
 - Recommendations Concerning Drug Unit Training and Practices (No. 007-93).
 - Reference Concerning the Employee Assistance Program (No. 025-93).
 - Recommendation Concerning a Note Retention Policy (No. 039-93).

- 1992 • Reference Concerning Delay and Procedural Irregularity in Complaint Dispositions (No. 032-92).

BOARD DECISIONS

The Board was approached in the fall of 1996 by Earls court Press Ltd. (Ont.) for permission to publish thirty of the Board's decisions in the national Police Law Reports. This will be a new publication devoted to reporting decisions from tribunals and courts across Canada, in relation to various aspects of policing. The Board has authorized the requested publication. The Board decisions (if publication proceeds) will constitute one of the largest (if not the largest) contribution from any Canadian jurisdiction to the first two volumes of these reports.

CONFERENCES AND PRESENTATIONS

The Board has strived to keep abreast of new knowledge and initiatives in the areas of public complaints and police discipline practices. Various conferences and meetings have been attended by the Board Chairman for this purpose. In several instances the Board Chairman (or other Board members) have made presentations to the conference assembly. The following conferences or meetings were attended in 1996.

- February, 1996 Recruit Training Class, Calgary Police Service (presentation).
- March, 1996 Alberta Association of Municipal Police Boards, Edmonton (presentation).
- July, 1996 Recruit Training Class, Edmonton Police Service (presentation).
- October, 1996 Canadian Association of Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (C.A.C.O.L.E. - Halifax - report on Alberta by Chairman).

TECHNOLOGY ADVANCES

The Board has taken steps in 1996 to improve its information gathering and access technology. In that connection an Internet address has been obtained and the Board is E-mail capable. The new E-mail address is: lerb@mgate.just.gov.ab.ca. The E-mail address will be printed on all newly acquired letterhead.

SUMMARY OF BOARD DECISIONS

Citizen Appeals

Allowed in Part

Mr. D. Rickerd appealed the decision regarding his complaint that during his arrest over a traffic dispute, he was assaulted and verbally abused by members of the Edmonton Police Service. After hearing the evidence the Board determined that the decision of the Chief of Police was justified in the majority of determinations made. The appeal was allowed in part concerning one allegation of misconduct. An official warning was issued to the member.

Mr. Y. Kadri appealed the decision resulting from the arrest of his son. Mr. Kadri's complaint was that a member of the Edmonton Police Service unlawfully entered his residence, used excessive force on his son during the arrest procedure causing injury, and used profane language in the presence of children. After hearing the evidence the Board was satisfied that Mr. Kadri had met the burden of proof with respect to one of the complaint allegations. The previous decision was therefore affirmed in part and the appeal was allowed concerning one allegation of misconduct. An official warning was issued to the member.

Mr. R. Ilnicki appealed the decision regarding his complaints that a warrant was not produced at the time of his arrest, that unnecessary force was used during his arrest and that he was unlawfully strip searched. After hearing the evidence the Board determined that the decision of the Chief of Police was affirmed in the majority of determinations made; however, one disposition was rejected. The appeal was allowed in part. References regarding strip search policy were made to all Alberta Police Commissions.

Dismissed Upon Hearing

Mr. A. Samad appealed the decision regarding his complaint that he was threatened and assaulted by an off-duty member of the Edmonton Police Service. After hearing the evidence presented, the Board was of the view that Mr. Samad had not met the burden of proof and the appeal was dismissed. The Board, however, admonished the off-duty member for using profane and abusive language.

Mr. T. Sedgwick appealed the decision regarding his complaint that he was treated in a rude manner, stopped and detained without justification by members of the Calgary Police Service. After hearing the evidence, the Board was not satisfied that Mr. Sedgwick had met the burden of proof and the appeal was dismissed.

Mr. J. Rochon appealed the decision regarding his complaint of neglect of duty and malicious prosecution surrounding his arrest by a member of the Edmonton Police Service. After hearing the evidence presented, the Board was not persuaded that Mr. Rochon had met the burden of proof. The appeal was therefore dismissed.

Mr. T. Bigl appealed the decision on his complaint of unnecessary exercise of authority by a member of the Edmonton Police Service regarding seizure of property in Mr. Bigl's possession. After hearing the evidence the Board was not satisfied that Mr. Bigl had met the burden of proof and that the Chief of Police was justified in his determination on this manner. The appeal was therefore dismissed.

Ms. E. Bolton appealed the decision on her complaint that a member of her family was treated in an abusive manner by a member of the Edmonton Police Service. After careful consideration of the evidence presented, the Board was not satisfied that Ms. Bolton met the burden of proof and the appeal was dismissed.

Mr. B. Grewal appealed the decision regarding complaints he felt were not properly investigated and that he and members of his family were harassed by members of the Edmonton Police Service. After hearing the evidence presented, the Board was not satisfied Mr. Grewal had met the burden of proof. The Board was of the view that the Chief of Police was justified in his determination of this matter and the appeal was dismissed.

Mr. G. Kalin appealed the decision of the Calgary Chief of Police regarding the ticketing and towing of his vehicle. After hearing the evidence the Board was persuaded that the appeal was advanced on a frivolous and vexatious basis. The appeal was therefore dismissed and costs were ordered against Mr. Kalin.

Mr. W. Morin appealed the decision regarding his complaints arising from his arrest. Mr. Morin claimed he was arrested without being given a reason and was not immediately

read his rights. In addition Mr. Morin stated excessive force was used and members of the Calgary Police Service made derogatory remarks toward him while he was in custody. After hearing the evidence the Board was not satisfied that Mr. Morin had met the burden of proof and the Chief of Police was justified in her determination of this matter. The appeal was therefore dismissed.

Mr. R. Laszlo appealed the decision regarding complaints that excessive force was used when he was arrested, he was not advised of his rights, and some of his personal property was missing when he was released from custody. After hearing the evidence presented, the Board was not persuaded that Mr. Laszlo met the burden of proof. The appeal was dismissed. References were made to the Calgary Police Commission regarding the practices and policies of shackling a detained person, and videotaping of the elevator area leading to the detention cells.

Mr. D. Stevelman appealed the decision regarding his complaints against members of the Calgary Police Service for arresting and threatening to detain him without just cause, and for using profane language. After hearing the evidence presented, the Board was not satisfied that Mr. Stevelman had met the burden of proof and the appeal was dismissed. In addition, the Board was persuaded that the appeal in this connection was frivolous and costs were awarded against Mr. Stevelman.

Mr. D. Dhariwal appealed the decision regarding his complaint that he was issued a traffic infraction ticket by a member of the Calgary Police Service without sufficient grounds. In considering all the evidence presented at the hearing, the Board was not satisfied that Mr. Dhariwal met the burden of proof. The appeal was therefore dismissed.

Mr. C. Powers appealed the decision on his complaint regarding the issuing of traffic tickets and the treatment of a family member by a member of the Edmonton Police Service. After reviewing the written submissions presented, the Board was not persuaded that Mr. Powers met the burden of proof. The appeal was dismissed. Recommendations were made to the Edmonton and Calgary Police Commissions concerning training and the disciplinary hearing process.

Mr. D. Mcleod appealed the decision regarding his complaint that he was mistreated by members of the Calgary Police Service while under arrest, resulting in bodily injury. After hearing the evidence presented, the Board was of the view that Mr. Mcleod had not met the burden of proof. The appeal was therefore dismissed.

Mr. L. Borowski appealed the decision regarding interactions with a member of the Calgary Police Service. This complaint arises as a result of a previous complaint filed by Mr. Borowski. Mr. Borowski claims that the member failed to conduct himself appropriately before and during a disciplinary hearing. In considering all the evidence presented at the

hearing, the Board was not satisfied that Mr. Borowski met the burden of proof. The appeal was therefore dismissed. Recommendations were made for improvement of the disciplinary hearings process.

Mr. S. Rowe appealed the decision regarding his complaint that an investigation regarding his missing tools was not conducted properly. After hearing the evidence, the Board was not satisfied that Mr. Rowe had met the burden of proof and the appeal was dismissed.

Mr. A. Porto appealed the decision regarding his complaint that a police service dog was permitted to inflict unnecessary bites to his arm. After hearing the evidence the Board was not satisfied that Mr. Porto had met the burden of proof and the appeal was dismissed.

Ms. B. Edwards appealed the decision regarding her complaint that she was assaulted by a member of the Edmonton Police Service. After hearing the evidence, the Board was not satisfied that Ms. Edwards had met the burden of proof and the appeal was dismissed.

Dismissed - Lack of Prosecution

Mr. A. Capotorto appealed the decision of the Chief of Police regarding a neighbour dispute. Mr. Capotorto was notified of the appeal hearing but failed to attend. The appeal was dismissed for lack of prosecution.

Mr. P. Unrau appealed the decision regarding several complaints against members of the Edmonton Police Service. Mr. Unrau attended the hearing but was not prepared to proceed. The appeal was therefore dismissed for lack of prosecution.

Mr. D. Davies appealed several decisions concerning actions by various members of the Calgary Police Service. Mr. Davies did not appear at the scheduled time. The appeal was dismissed for lack of prosecution. The Board was satisfied Mr. Davies conducted himself in a frivolous and vexatious manner. Costs were awarded against Mr. Davies.

Mr. R. Singh appealed the decision concerning his complaint of how an investigation was conducted on him by a member of the Edmonton Police Service. Mr. Singh failed to appear at the scheduled time for his hearing. The appeal was therefore dismissed for lack of prosecution.

Mrs. M. Hazlett filed an appeal with the Board. The Board corresponded with Mrs. Hazlett and requested on a number of occasions whether she intended to proceed with her appeal. The Board did not receive a response from Mrs. Hazlett. The appeal was dismissed for lack of prosecution.

Mr. D. Knight appealed the decision regarding neglect of duty by members of the Calgary Police Service. Mr. Knight failed to appear for his hearing at the scheduled time. The appeal was therefore dismissed for lack of prosecution.

Mr. M. Norris appealed the decision regarding his complaint that when being issued traffic violation tickets, a member of the Edmonton Police Service treated him in a hostile manner, used profanity and made derogatory remarks. Mr. Norris failed to appear for his scheduled hearing and the appeal was dismissed for lack of prosecution.

Mr. S. Lohrer appealed the decision of the Chief of Police regarding his complaints that a proper investigation was not conducted which led to his arrest, that members of the Calgary Police Service made inappropriate remarks, and that he was released into the cold without warm clothing. Mr. Lohrer did not appear for his hearing on the scheduled date. The appeal was therefore dismissed for lack of prosecution.

Mr. R. Smith appealed the decision regarding his complaint that he was arrested without cause, documents were removed from his residence without his permission and his reputation was slandered causing him to lose work. Mr. Smith did not appear for his hearing on the scheduled date. The appeal was dismissed for lack of prosecution.

Mr. R. Trikha appealed the decision regarding an investigation conducted by members of the Edmonton Police Service which led to his arrest. Mr. Trikha did not appear for his scheduled hearing and the appeal was therefore dismissed for lack of prosecution.

Mr. L. Martens appealed the decision regarding his complaint that a member of the Lethbridge Police Service disclosed confidential information about him. Mr. Martens did not appear on the scheduled date of his hearing. The appeal was therefore dismissed for lack of prosecution.

Mr. F. Hogan appealed the decision of the Chief of Police regarding his complaint that a member of the Edmonton Police Service disclosed false and misleading information about him. Mr. Hogan failed to appear for his scheduled hearing. The appeal was dismissed for lack of prosecution.

Withdrawn

Mr. G. Leven appealed the decision regarding his complaint that a member of the Edmonton Police Service used excessive force. Mr. Leven informed the Board prior to the hearing that he would be withdrawing his appeal.

Mr. K. O'Reilly appealed the decision regarding his complaints about incidents surrounding his arrest. Prior to the hearing, Mr. O'Reilly informed the Board that he did not wish to proceed and the appeal was withdrawn.

Mr. M. Antoine appealed the decision regarding the use of excessive force and the conduct of members of the Lethbridge Police Service during the wrongful arrest of his wife. Prior to the hearing, Mr. Antoine informed that Board that he would be withdrawing his appeal.

Mr. E. Burgoin filed various complaints against members of the Calgary Police Service. Counsel for Mr. Burgoin advised the Board prior to the hearing that his client wished to abandon his appeal. The request was granted; however, the Board conducted a hearing with respect to the application for costs by the Calgary Police Service. The application for costs was dismissed.

Officer Appeals

Withdrawn

Detective W. Tonowski advised the Board prior to his appeal hearing that he wished to withdraw his appeal with the Board. The request was granted and the appeal was withdrawn.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF APPEALS FILED WITH THE BOARD

Summary of Activities - 1994 - 1996

The following information has been compiled in order to provide a summation of the activities of the Law Enforcement Review Board for the years 1994 to 1996.

During the year 1994, 31 appeals were disposed of by the Board. Of the 31 cases heard, 5 (16%) were allowed (including 1 allowed in part), 22 (71%) were dismissed and 4 (13%) were withdrawn. Of the 22 dismissed appeals, 13 (59%) were dismissed upon hearing, 8 (36%) were dismissed for Lack of Prosecution and 1 (5%) for Lack of Jurisdiction. The number of Calgary citizen appeals was higher than Edmonton with 18 (64%) and 7(25%) respectively. There were 3 (11%) appeals from Lethbridge.

The statistical analysis for 1994 does not reflect circumstances where it was considered appropriate to deliver a Board admonishment concerning a particular of conduct. In 1994, the Board admonished one police officer for unsatisfactory conduct. Also absent from the activities tables is a report on Board references to police commissions. In 1994, the Board made one reference to police commissions on matters pertaining to policy and one reference to the Assistant Deputy Minister of Justice (Court Services).

In 1995, the Law Enforcement Review Board disposed of 47 appeals. Of the 47 cases heard, 7 appeals (22% of appeals heard) were allowed (including three allowed in part), 31 were dismissed, 8 were withdrawn and one appeal was reheard. Of the 31 dismissed appeals, 22 were dismissed upon hearing, 5 were dismissed for lack of prosecution and four were dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. The number of Calgary citizen appeals was higher than the number for Edmonton, with 29 (62%) and 12 (26%) respectively.

As was the case in 1994, the 1995 statistical analysis does not indicate where it was appropriate to deliver a Board admonishment or caution. In 1995, the Board admonished three police officers for unsatisfactory conduct and one officer was cautioned. Also absent from the activities tables is a report on Board references to police commissions. In 1995, the Board made two references to a police commission on matters pertaining to policy.

In 1996, the Law Enforcement Review Board disposed of 37 appeals. Of the 37 cases heard, 3 appeals (8% of appeals heard) were allowed in part, 29 were dismissed and 5 were withdrawn. Of the 29 dismissed appeals, 16 were dismissed upon hearing and 13 were dismissed for lack of prosecution. The number of Calgary citizen appeals was lower than the number for Edmonton, with 14 (38%) and 21 (57%) respectively. This is the first time on record (in over a decade) that Edmonton has had a higher number of citizen appeals over Calgary. There were 2 (5%) appeals from Lethbridge. As was seen in past years, most of the appeals related to charges of excessive use of force, unnecessary use of authority or improper conduct.

Statistical analysis for 1996 does not indicate where it was appropriate to deliver a Board admonishment or caution. In 1996, the Board admonished one police office for use of profane and abusive language. Also absent from the activity tables is a report on References and Recommendations to police commissions. In 1996, the Board made four references or recommendations to a police commission on matters pertaining to policies and/or practices.

During the years 1994, 1995 and 1996, there were no cases before the Board involving private investigators, security guards or special constables.

The following table outlines the activities of the Board for 1994, 1995, and 1996.

LAW ENFORCEMENT REVIEW BOARD ACTIVITIES

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES

Table - Cases Disposed of by the Board - 1994 - 1996

DISPOSITION	1994			1995			1996		
	CIVILIAN	POLICE	TOTAL	%	CIVILIAN	POLICE	TOTAL	%	%
Appeals Allowed - Calgary - Edmonton	4 1*		5	16	4 3		7	15	3 8
Appeals Dismissed Upon Hearing - Calgary - Edmonton - Medicine Hat - Lethbridge	8 2 1	2	13	42	17 3 1	1	22	47	9 8 32
Appeals Dismissed for Lack of Prosecution - Calgary - Edmonton - Camrose - Lethbridge	5 3		8	26	2 2 1		5	11	3 8 1
Appeals Dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction - Calgary - Edmonton - Lethbridge		1	1	3	1	2 1	4	8	
Referred to Attorney General			0	0			0	0	0 14
Withdrawn by Complainant - Calgary - Edmonton - Lacombe - Camrose - Lethbridge	1 1		4	13	3 3 1	1	8	17	2 1 1
Rehearing - Calgary					1		1	2	
TOTAL - Calgary - Edmonton - Medicine Hat - Lacombe - Camrose - Lethbridge	28 18 7 3	3 3	31 21 7 3	100 67 22 11	42 28 11 2 1	5 3 1 1	47 31 12 2 2	100 66 26 4 4	36 14 20 2 2

1996 BREAKDOWN OF APPEALS FILED WITH THE LAW ENFORCEMENT REVIEW BOARD

Location/Police Service Involved	ALLOWED	DISMISSED UPON HEARING	ALLOWED IN PART	WITHDRAWN	DISMISSED - LACK OF PROSECUTION	DISMISSED - LACK OF JURISDICTION
EDMONTON		Samad, A.	Rickard, D.	Leven, G.	Capolotto, A.	
		Rochon, J.	Kadi, Y.	Tonowski, W. *	Utrau, P.	
		Bigl, T.	Ilinski, R.		Singh, R.	
		Bolton, E.			Hazlett, M.	
		Grewal, B.			Norris, M.	
		Powers, C.			Smith, R.	
		Porto, A.			Trikha, R.	
		Edwards, B.			Hogan, F.	
CALGARY		Sedgwick, T.		O'Reilly, K.	Davies, D.	
		Kalin, G.		Burgoin, E.	Knight, D.	
		Morrin, W.			Loherer, S.	
		Lazlo, R.				
		Stevelman, D.				
		Dharival, D.				
		Berowski, L.				
		McLeod, D.				
		Rowe, S.				
LETHBRIDGE				Antoine, M.	Martens, L.	

* - represents officer appeals

Totals =	Citizen Appeals =	36
	Officer Appeals =	1
	Rehearing =	0
TOTAL		37

LAW ENFORCEMENT REVIEW BOARD ACTIVITIES**APPEALS DISPOSED OF BY THE BOARD - 1996**

Appeals Allowed	00
Appeals Allowed in Part	03
Appeals Dismissed	
Upon Hearing	16
For Lack of Prosecution	13
For Lack of Jurisdiction	00
Referred to Attorney	
General	00
Withdrawn by Complainant	05
Rehearing	00
TOTAL	37